

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.


Claim 1 has been amended to recite more specifically the amount of the emulsifier and the anti-spatter agent. The amendment is supported at page 6, lines 27-28 and page 7, lines 23-24 of the specification.

While the Office characterizes the last paragraph of page 2 of the specification as stating that only specific ingredients are effective to achieve the desired product of the claims, it is submitted that claim 1 is fully in line with page 2. The last paragraph of page 2 speaks of a composition which comprises a specified emulsifier. However, claim 1 recites at least one emulsifier having a hydrophilic/lipophilic balance value of at least 7. It is submitted that this is the specified emulsifier referred to. Likewise, page 2, last paragraph refers to an anti-spattering agent and claim 1 recites an anti-spattering agent, so it appears that claim 1 is consistent with the first paragraph of the Summary of the Invention on page 2.

The discussion beginning at page 7 of the specification, wherein it is stated that any suitable anti-spattering agent can be used, is also consistent with the claims. The specification, in addition to setting forth any number of lecithins which can be used, also names at page 8 alternative anti-spattering agents, i.e., dispersed gas phase, sand, hydrophobic particles such as silica particles and citric acid esters. It is submitted that the Office has not satisfied its burden to explain why one of ordinary skill would not reasonably expect to be able to practice the invention with anti-spattering agents other than the combination of lecithin and salt.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application, as amended, be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerard J. McGowan, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 29,412

GJM:pod
(201) 894-2297